IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: James John Wilson et al ) Confirmation No. 3836 Docket No. DN2001117 For: REDUCED NOISE MULTI -Art Unit: 3682 RIBBED TRANSMISSION BELT Examiner: Justin Stefanon ) I hereby certify that this correspondence is being Serial No. 09/893\_156 submitted via facsimile transmission to the USPTO Filed: June 27, 2001 ) rawczyk of Registered Representative) Assistant Commissioner of Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

OFFICIAL

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on March 11, 2003, Axplaints English Deliver D the following remarks.

**REMARKS** 

APR **0 4** 2003

**GROUP 3600** 

## 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,215,504 to Wong et al. This rejection is traversed for the reasons set forth below.

In paragraph 4 of the Final Office Action, it states that "Applicant correctly asserts that the longitudinally grooves of Wong do not lie along the longitudinal direction of the belt." The position is taken that the grooves 18 of Wong have a "longitudinal direction of their own, transverse to the longitudinal direction of the belt". By the statements in Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, it is being acknowledged that the longitudinal direction of the belt of Wong as shown in Figures 2A-2C is from right to left, or left to right. Thus the longitudinal length of a belt element, whether it is a groove or a cog, is also from right to left or left to right in the Figures.

Claim 1 recites that the grooves of the belt form "transverse rows of cogs on the belt inner surface, wherein the rows of cogs have at least three different longitudinal lengths, and the rows of differing lengths are randomly arranged, in a non-sequential manner, along the entire length of the belt." Regardless of how grooves 12 or 18 of Wong are characterized, as